



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,472	07/30/2003	Jack E. Ozzie	MI103.70271US02	9188
45840 7590 12/03/2009 WOLF GREENFIELD (Microsoft Corporation) C/O WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C. 600 ATLANTIC AVENUE BOSTON, MA 02210-2206				
EXAMINER				
SCOTT, RANDY A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2453				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/03/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/630,472

Applicant(s)

OZZIE ET AL.

Examiner

RANDY SCOTT

Art Unit

2453

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15, 16, 18-34 and 38-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15, 16, 18-34 and 38-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/29/09.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to communication filed 6/23/2009
2. Claims 14, 17 and 35-37 have been cancelled. Claims 1-3, 6- 13, 15-16, 18, 20, 22, 23, 30-34 have been amended. New claims 38-40 have been added.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office Action:

A person shall be granted a patent unless-

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 USC 102 (e) as being anticipated by Sasaki ET al (US 5,667,440).

Regarding claims 1 and 18, Sasaki et al discloses:

Operating at least two of the plurality of computers used by inviting members (see col. 12, lines 47-49) to independently assign unique designations to endpoints of members invited to join the telespace (see col. 8, lines 30-32, which teaches assigning a distribution number to each terminal invited to join the game), each designation of an endpoint of an invited member

comprising: (a) a value indicative of the order in which the invited member was invited by a respective inviting member to join the telespace (see col. 13, lines 1-6, which teaches a maximum subscription number for each game room and distribution number for each member invited to join); and

(b) a unique endpoint designation indicative of the respective inviting member (see col. 14, lines 17-22).

Regarding claims 2 and 19, Sasaki et al discloses a unique numeral designation to each endpoint (see col. 13, lines 20-22).

Regarding claims 3 and 20, Sasaki et al discloses a unique serial numeral designation for each endpoint wherein the serial numeral designation comprises a series of numbers including the numeral designation of the respective inviting member (see col. 7, lines 39-44).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained through the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 4-5, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki ET al (US 5,667,440) in view of Grimm et al (US 5,828,843).

With respect to claims 4 and 21, Sasaki et al (US 5,667,440) discloses the limitations discussed above.

Sasaki et al teaches all the limitations of claims 4 and 21, except for wherein a plurality of the designations of different endpoints each indicates a chain of inviting members.

The general concept of wherein a plurality of the designations of different endpoints each indicate a chain of inviting members (see col. 10, lines 48-56, which teaches that attributes and values are provided for links and IP addresses of users currently participating in the gaming environment before the requested user joins) is well known in the art as illustrated by Grimm et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki et al with the general concept of wherein a plurality of the designations of different endpoints each indicate a chain of inviting members, as illustrated by Grimm et al, in order to effectively implement a peer to peer data sharing system.

With respect to claims 5 and 22, Sasaki et al (US 5,667,440) discloses the limitations discussed above.

Sasaki et al teaches all the limitations of claims 5 and 22, except for wherein endpoint designations comprise a number of orders, including a first order designating a founding member of the telespace, and at least a second order designating a member invited to join the telespace by the founding member.

The general concepts of wherein endpoint designations comprise a number of orders, including a first order designating a founding member of the telespace (see col. 10, lines 59-67,

which teaches that the match making mechanism creates records and metrics for the first member of a peer to peer gaming virtual room) and at least a second order designating a member invited to join the telepace by the founding member (see col. 11, lines 1-3, “requests from other clients”) are well known in the art as illustrated by Grimm et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki et al with the general concepts of wherein endpoint designations comprise a number of orders, including a first order designating a founding member of the telepace, and at least a second order designating a member invited to join the telepace by the founding member, as illustrated by Grimm et al, in order to effectively implement a peer to peer data sharing system.

7. Claims 6 and 23 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki ET al (US 5,667,440) in view of Shear et al (US 6,112,181).

With respect to claims 6 and 23, Sasaki et al (US 5,667,440) discloses the limitations previously discussed.

Sasaki et al teaches all the limitations of claims 6 and 23, except for assigning, by the founding member, each of a plurality of endpoints corresponding to a new member of the telepace invited into the telepace by the founding member a unique designation comprising the first order digit of the founding telepace member, and a second order digit, the second order digits of the designations of endpoints of the new members being in a sequential order indicating the order in which the new members joined the telepace.

The general concepts of assigning, by the founding member, each of a plurality of endpoints corresponding to a new member of the telepace invited into the telepace by the

founding member a unique designation comprising the first order digit of the founding telepace member (see col. 52, lines 1-5, "user or group ID field," also see col. 18, lines -11, which teaches that the method pertains to an online gaming environment), and a second order digit, the second order digits of the designations of endpoints of the new members being in a sequential order indicating the order in which the new members joined the telepace (see col. 53, lines 57-65) are well known in the art as illustrated by Shear et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki et al with the general concepts of assigning, by the founding member, each of a plurality of endpoints corresponding to a new member of the telepace invited into the telepace by the founding member a unique designation comprising the first order digit of the founding telepace member, and a second order digit, the second order digits of the designations of endpoints of the new members being in a sequential order indicating the order in which the new members joined the telepace, as illustrated by Shear et al, in order to sufficiently regulate a peer to peer data exchange network.

8. Claims 7-10 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki ET al (US 5,667,440) in view of Shear et al (US 6,112,181), further in view of Sharpe et al (US 5,898,834).

With respect to claims 7 and 24, Sasaki ET al (US 5,667,440) discloses the limitations previously discussed.

Sasaki et al teaches all the limitations of claims 7 and 24, except for inserting endpoint designations into data change requests.

The general concepts of the claims in which claims 7 and 24 are dependent upon are well known in the art as illustrated by Shear et al, as discussed above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki et al with the general concepts of claims in which claims 7 and 24 are dependent upon, as illustrated by Shear et al, in order to sufficiently regulate a peer to peer data exchange network.

Sasaki et al, in combination with Shear et al, teach all the limitations of claims 7 and 24, except for inserting endpoint designations into data change requests.

The general concept of inserting endpoint designations into data change requests (see col. 14, lines 56-59, which teaches a change request in relation to the client pairing with the service providing mechanism) is well known in the art as illustrated by Sharpe et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki et al and Shear et al with the general concept of inserting endpoint designations into data change requests, as illustrated by Sharpe et al, in order to sufficiently regulate a peer to peer data exchange network.

With respect to claims 8 and 25, Sasaki ET al (US 5,667,440) discloses the limitations previously discussed.

Sasaki et al teaches all the limitations of claims 8 and 25, except for inserting endpoint designations into data change requests.

The general concepts of the claims in which claims 8 and 25 are dependent upon are well known in the art as illustrated by Shear et al, as discussed above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki et al with the general concepts of claims in which claims 8 and 25 are dependent upon, as illustrated by Shear et al, in order to sufficiently regulate a peer to peer data exchange network.

Sasaki et al, in combination with Shear et al, teach all the limitations of claims 8 and 25, except for using the endpoint designations in data change requests to resolve a dependency collision between two data requests.

The general concept of using the endpoint designations in data change requests to resolve a dependency collision between two data requests (see col. 13, lines 9-12, which teaches a detecting a collision due to data request conflict and the resulting processed action) is well known in the art as illustrated by Sharpe et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki et al and Shear et al with the general concept of using the endpoint designations in data change requests to resolve a dependency collision between two data requests, as illustrated by Sharpe et al, in order to sufficiently regulate a peer to peer data exchange network.

With respect to claims 9 and 26, Sasaki ET al (US 5,667,440) discloses the limitations previously discussed.

Sasaki et al teaches all the limitations of claims 9 and 26, except for inserting endpoint designations into data change requests.

The general concepts of the claims in which claims 9 and 26 are dependent upon are well known in the art as illustrated by Shear et al, as discussed above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki et al with the general concepts of claims in which claims 9 and 26 are dependent upon, as illustrated by Shear et al, in order to sufficiently regulate a peer to peer data exchange network.

Sasaki et al, in combination with Shear et al, teach all the limitations of claims 9 and 26, except for resolving a dependency collision while maintaining total ordering.

The general concept of resolving a dependency collision while maintaining total ordering (see col. 16, lines 42-45) is well known in the art as illustrated by Sharpe et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki et al and Shear et al with the general concept of resolving a dependency collision while maintaining total ordering, as illustrated by Sharpe et al, in order to sufficiently regulate a peer to peer data exchange network.

With respect to claims 10 and 27, Sasaki ET al (US 5,667,440) discloses the limitations previously discussed.

Sasaki et al teaches all the limitations of claims 10 and 27, except for inserting endpoint designations into data change requests.

The general concepts of the claims in which claim 10 is dependent upon are well known in the art as illustrated by Shear et al, as discussed above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki et al with the general concepts of claims in which claims 10 and 27 are dependent upon, as illustrated by Shear et al, in order to sufficiently regulate a peer to peer data exchange network.

Sasaki et al, in combination with Shear et al, teach all the limitations of claims 10 and 27, except for comparing endpoint digits on an order-by-order basis; and scheduling data change requests so that data change requests with the lowest endpoint digits in the lowest orders are scheduled for processing first.

The general concept of comparing endpoint digits on an order-by-order basis (see col. 16, lines 42-45); and scheduling data change requests so that data change requests with the lowest endpoint digits in the lowest orders are scheduled for processing first (see col. 14, lines 50-55, which teaches determining the order in which the actions are to be implemented) is well known in the art as illustrated by Sharpe et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki et al and Shear et al with the general concept of comparing endpoint digits on an order-by-order basis; and scheduling data change requests so that data change requests with the lowest endpoint digits in the lowest orders are scheduled for processing first, as illustrated by Sharpe et al, in order to sufficiently regulate a peer to peer data exchange network.

9. Claims 11-13, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki ET al (US 5,667,440) in view of Sharpe et al (US 5,898,834).

With respect to claims 11 and 28, Sasaki ET al (US 5,667,440) discloses the limitations previously discussed.

Sasaki et al teaches all the limitations of claims 11 and 28, except for inserting endpoint designations into data change requests.

The general concept of inserting endpoint designations into data change requests (see col. 14, lines 55-60) is well known in the art as illustrated by Sharpe et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki et al with the general concept of inserting endpoint designations into data change requests, as illustrated by Sharpe et al, in order to sufficiently regulate a peer to peer data exchange network.

With respect to claims 12 and 29, Sasaki ET al (US 5,667,440) discloses the limitations previously discussed.

Sasaki et al teaches all the limitations of claims 12 and 29, except for using the endpoint designations in data change requests to resolve a dependency collision between two data requests.

The general concept of using the endpoint designations in data change requests to resolve a dependency collision between two data requests (see col. 16, lines 42-45) is well known in the art as illustrated by Sharpe et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki et al with the general concept of using the endpoint designations in data change requests to resolve a dependency collision between two data requests, as illustrated by Sharpe et al, in order to sufficiently regulate a peer to peer data exchange network.

With respect to claims 13 and 30, Sasaki ET al (US 5,667,440) discloses the limitations previously discussed.

Sasaki et al teaches all the limitations of claims 13 and 30, except for resolving a dependency collision while maintaining total ordering.

The general concept of resolving a dependency collision while maintaining total ordering (see col. 13, lines 10-12) is well known in the art as illustrated by Sharpe et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki et al with the general concept of resolving a dependency collision while maintaining total ordering, as illustrated by Sharpe et al, in order to sufficiently regulate a peer to peer data exchange network.

10. Claims 16, and 31-33 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki ET al (US 5,667,440) in view of Golberg et al (US 5,823,879).

With respect to claim 31, Sasaki ET al (US 5,667,440) discloses the limitations previously discussed.

Sasaki et al teaches all the limitations of claim 31, except for assigning a unique designation to each new telepace member that an inviting endpoint invites into the telepace.

The general concept of assigning a unique designation to each new telepace member that an inviting endpoint invites into the telepace (see col. 28, lines 60-67, which discloses the identifier assigned to a new user joining the gaming lobby, shown in col. 28, lines 1-4) is well known in the art as illustrated by Goldberg et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki et al with the general concept of assigning a unique designation to each new telepace member that an inviting endpoint invites into the telepace, as illustrated by Goldberg et al, in order to successfully implement a virtual gaming lobby.

With respect to claims 15 and 32, Sasaki ET al (US 5,667,440) discloses the limitations previously discussed.

Sasaki et al teaches all the limitations of claims 15 and 32, except for the inviting member assigning an endpoint designation that is unique within the telespace.

The general concept of the inviting member assigning an endpoint designation that is unique within the telespace (see col. 8, lines 1-5, "unique player identification code") is well known in the art as illustrated by Goldberg et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki et al with the general concept of the inviting member assigning an endpoint designation that is unique within the telespace, as illustrated by Goldberg et al, in order to successfully implement a virtual gaming lobby.

With respect to claims 16 and 33, Sasaki ET al (US 5,667,440) discloses the limitations previously discussed.

Sasaki et al teaches all the limitations of claims 16 and 33, except for the inviting member assigning an endpoint designation that is unique within the collaboration system.

The general concept of the inviting member assigning an endpoint designation that is unique within the collaboration system (see col. 8, lines 1-5, "unique player identification code") is well known in the art as illustrated by Goldberg et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki et al with the general concept of the inviting member assigning an endpoint designation that is unique within

the collaboration system, as illustrated by Goldberg et al, in order to successfully implement a virtual gaming lobby.

11. Claims 34 is rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki ET al (US 5,667,440) in view of Davis et al (US 6,030,288).

With respect to claim 34, Sasaki ET al (US 5,667,440) discloses the limitation previously discussed.

Sasaki et al teaches all the limitations of claim 34, except for using a pseudo-random number generator to generate each designation.

The general concept of using a pseudo-random number generator to generate each designation (see col. 2, lines 60-65, which discloses that random numbers are generated to perform the processes within the gaming environment) is well known in the art as illustrated by Davis et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki et al with the general concept of using a pseudo-random number generator to generate each designation, as illustrated by Davis et al, in order to successfully process gaming transactions.

12. Claims 38-40 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Gudjonsson ET al (US 6,564,261) in view of Hertzog et al (US 2003/0069874).

With respect to claim 38, Gudjonsson ET al discloses receiving an invitation for the invited member to join the shared telespace, the invitation being sent by an inviting member of the plurality of members having an inviting member endpoint designation (see col. 3, lines 7-10);

receiving from a computer of the inviting member an invited member endpoint designation for the invited member (see fig. 3); and transmitting change messages indicating changes to the shared telespace, each change message comprising the invited member endpoint designation (see col. 3, lines 5-10).

Gudjonsson et al fails to teach the invited member endpoint designation having a hierarchical representation with a first portion identifying the inviting member endpoint designation and a second portion identifying when the invited member was invited to join the shared telespace relative to when the inviting member invited other members to join the shared telespace.

In particular Hertzog et al teaches the general concept of the invited member endpoint designation having a hierarchical representation with a first portion identifying the inviting member endpoint designation (see sec [0102], lines 9-12, “recruiter identifier”) and a second portion identifying when the invited member was invited to join the shared telespace relative to when the inviting member invited other members to join the shared telespace (see sec [0102], lines 14-17, “time at which invitation was sent”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Gudjonsson et al with the general concept of the invited member endpoint designation having a hierarchical representation with a first portion identifying the inviting member endpoint designation and a second portion identifying when the invited member was invited to join the shared telespace relative to when the inviting member invited other members to join the shared telespace, as illustrated by Hertzog et al, in order to efficiently allow clients to communicate with other members in a peer network.

With respect to claim 39, Gudjonsson ET al discloses the limitations discussed previously.

Gudjonsson et al fails to teach wherein the second portion of the invited member endpoint designation comprises a sequence number generated by the inviting member.

In particular Hertzog et al teaches wherein the second portion of the invited member endpoint designation comprises a sequence number generated by the inviting member (see sec [0067], lines 3-7, “sequence identifier”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Gudjonsson et al with the general concept of wherein the second portion of the invited member endpoint designation comprises a sequence number generated by the inviting member, as illustrated by Hertzog et al, in order to efficiently allow clients to communicate with other members in a peer network.

With respect to claim 40, Gudjonsson ET al discloses inviting a second invited member to join the telepace (see fig. 4); and providing to a computer of the second invited member a second invited member designation (see fig. 12b), the second invited member designation having a hierarchical representation comprising a first portion identifying the inviting member endpoint designation (see col. 32, lines 65-67).

Gudjonsson et al fails to teach a second portion identifying when the invited member was invited to join the shared telepace relative to when the inviting member invited other members

to join the telespace; and a third portion identifying when the second invited member was invited to join the shared telespace relative to when the invited member invited other members to join the telespace.

In particular Hertzog et al teaches a second portion identifying when the invited member was invited to join the shared telespace relative to when the inviting member invited other members to join the telespace; and a third portion identifying when the second invited member was invited to join the shared telespace relative to when the invited member invited other members to join the telespace (see sec [0102], lines 14-17, “time at which invitation was sent”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Gudjonsson et al with the general concept of a second portion identifying when the invited member was invited to join the shared telespace relative to when the inviting member invited other members to join the telespace; and a third portion identifying when the second invited member was invited to join the shared telespace relative to when the invited member invited other members to join the telespace, as illustrated by Hertzog et al, in order to efficiently allow clients to communicate with other members in a peer network.

A. Applicant states that Link et al (US 6,012,096) fails to teach or suggest how IP addresses are assigned, inviting members to join a telepace or assigning endpoint designations to members, or assigning endpoint designations by members in a telepace.

14. *Response to Arguments*

15. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/23/09 have been fully considered but are moot in view of newly added claim language.

A. In response to the applicant's argument that Link et al (US 6,012,096) fails to teach or suggest how IP addresses are assigned, inviting members to join a telepace or assigning endpoint designations to members, or assigning endpoint designations by members in a telepace:

In view of the newly added claim language, Sasaki ET al (US 5,667,440) has been cited and discloses limitations for operating at least two of the plurality of computers used by inviting members (see col. 12, lines 47-49) to independently assign unique designations to endpoints of members invited to join the telepace (see col. 8, lines 30-32, which teaches assigning a distribution number to each terminal invited to join the game), each designation of an endpoint of an invited member comprising: (a) a value indicative of the order in which the invited member was invited by a respective inviting member to join the telepace (see col. 13, lines 1-6, which

teaches a maximum subscription number for each game room and distribution number for each member invited to join); and

(b) a unique endpoint designation indicative of the respective inviting member (see col. 14, lines 17-22).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Randy A. Scott whose telephone number is (571) 272-3797. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30 am-5:00 pm, second Fridays 7:30 am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (571) 272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/RANDY SCOTT/

Examiner, Art Unit 2453

Application/Control Number: 10/630,472

Page 21

Art Unit: 2453

20091030

/THUHA T. NGUYEN/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2453